

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 9, 2008. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 9 – 24 are pending in the application with Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24 are amended, Claims 14 and 21 are canceled, and Claims 25 – 36 are newly added.

Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24 are amended to include the limitations recited in Claims 14 and 21. Claims 31 – 36 recite the limitations of Claims 15 and 22 and depend from independent Claims 9, 10, 16, 17, 23 and 24. Claims 25 – 30 recite the limitations of Claims 13 – 15 and 20 – 22 in independent form including the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 13 – 15 and 20 – 22 recite allowable subject matter and thus would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including the base claims and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, since Claims 25 – 30 recite the limitations found in Claims 13 – 15 and 20 – 22 in independent form, these newly added claims are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Regarding Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24, these claims recite “a connector detector for detecting a connection...” as recited in allowable Claims 14 and 21. A connector detector is not anticipated by or rendered obvious over the teachings of Adair et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,901) and Crump et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,762,555), taken alone or in any proper combination.

It is well-settled by the Courts that “[A]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, et al., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir., 1984).

Therefore, as demonstrated above, because neither Adair et al. nor Crump et al. discloses each and every element recited in the present claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been obviated. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 12, 20 and newly added 31 – 36 depend from independent Claims 9 – 11, 16 – 18 and 23 – 24 and thus recite all the limitations of those independent claims. Therefore Claims 12, 20 and newly added 31 – 36 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references for at least the reasons provided above.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 9 – 13, 15 – 20 and 22 - 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE/TS/DAT:jam